DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 083 TM 850 564

AUTHOR Johnson, Martin A.; And Others
TITLE Self-Monitoring: A Comparison of Snyder, and Lennox and Wolfe Scales.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Rating Scales; Higher Education; Individual Differences; *Multidimensional Scaling; Role Perception; *Self Concept Measures; Self Esteem; Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Test Reliability; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS Self Monitoring; *Self Monitoring Scales (Snyder); Test Retest Reliability

ABSTRACT

This research compares the Snyder (1974) and Lennox and Wolfe (1982) self-monitoring scales. The data indicate that the Snyder scale is multidimensional. The factors of the Snyder scale correlate dissimilarly with important characteristics of self-monitors. Only the other-directedness factor is significantly related to behavioral cross situational variability. Unexpectedly, high self-monitors are not more accurate in their perception of social information. The factors of the scale correlate dissimilarly with self-esteem, inner-other directedness, social desirability, and performance styles P, R, and C. The Lennox and Wolfe scales show better psychometric properties. They have much higher levels of reliability. The three factors are relatively independent and show a more consistent pattern of relationships with related variables. High scorers on all scales are found to possess characteristics different than would be predicted from Snyder's construct. The findings raise questions as to the validity of self-monitoring as presently conceptualized. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED262083

Self-Monitoring: A Comparison of Snyder, and Lennox and Wolfe Scales

Martin A. Johnson, Leona Jewell, Laurie Tirrell

Missouri Western State College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Johnson, Martin A.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 850 564

Running head: COMPARISON OF SELF-MONITORING SCALES

Abstract

This research compares the Snyder (1974) and Lennox and Wolfe (1982) self-monitoring scales. The data indicate that the Snyder scale is multidimensional. The factors of the Snyder scale correlate dissimilarly with important characteristics of self-monitors. Only the other-directedness factor is significantly related to behavioral cross situational variability. Unexpectedly, high self-monitors are not more accurate in their perception of social information. The factors of the scale correlate dissimilarly with self-esteem, inner-other directedness, social desirability, and performance styles P, R, and C. The Lennox and Wolfe scales show better psychometric properties. They have much higher levels of reliability. The three factors are relatively independent and show a more consistent pattern of relationships with related variables. High scorers on all scales are found to possess characteristics different than would be predicted from Snyder's construct. The findings raise questions as to the validity of self-monitoring as presently conceptualized.

Self-Monitoring: A Comparison of Snyder, and Lennox and Wolfe Scales

Self-monitoring as conceptualized by Snyder (1974, 1979) suggests that there are consistent individual differences in the extent to which people regulate their self presentation by tailoring their behavior to immediate social cues. The theory suggests that people differ in their awareness of immediate situational cues indicating socially desirable behavior, and in their willingness to change their behavior to be congruent with the prevalent social cues. Theoretically, high self-monitors are more aware of social cues and demonstrate more cross situational variability of behavior than low self-monitors, who are more attuned to inner directives and tend to exhibit more consistent behaviors across situations.

This theory and its measurement have generated a great deal of interest and some dissenting opinion. Research directed at validating the construct, as measured by Snyder's scale, has produced unexpected results (Arkin et al., 1979; Schneiderman, 1980; Kulik & Taylor, 1981; Santee & Maslach, 1982; Lennox & Wolfe, 1982, 1984; Zanna et al., 1980; Zuckerman & Reis, 1978). Lennox and Wolfe (1982, 1984) argue that these failures to validate self-monitoring theory,

psychometric studies of the scale indicating a lack of congruence between the scale and the construct (Briggs, Cheek, & Buss, 1980; Gabrenaya & Arkin, 1980), and the poor reliability of the scale (Snyder, 1974; Briggs et al., 1980; Wolfe, Lennox, & Hudilburg, 1983), demonstrate a need to re-evaluate Snyder's scale. Lennox and Wolfe (1982) propose alternative scales for measuring self-monitoring which, they argue, more adequately measure the hypothetical components of the Snyder Construct.

This report presents some comparisons between Snyder's scale and three measures proposed by Lennox and Wolfe (1982). With respect to Snyder's scale, the three factors found in the scale by Briggs et al. (1980)--extraversion (E), otherdirectedness (O), and acting ability (AA)-- and the original Snyder Self-Monitoring Scale(SSMS) were studied. The Lennox and Wolfe (1982) scales used included the subscales titled cross situational variability (CSV), attention to social comparison information (ASCI), and ability to modify self presentation (AMSP). The scales were compared with respect to their reliability, the intercorrelation between the different components of the scales, and their relatedness to behavioral cross situational variability and accuracy of perception of

social information, their correlation with self-esteem, and other scales possibly related to self-monitoring.

Study 1

One limitation of the original Snyder scale is its modest reliability. Its internal consistency (coefficient alpha) coefficients are in the .60 to .70 range: Snyder (1974), .63, .70; Briggs et al. (1980), .67, .69; Santee and Maslach (1982), .66. Reliability studies on the Lennox and Wolfe scales have been more promising with scale and subscale coefficient alpha values in the range of .77 to .88 (Lennox and Wolfe, 1982). A test-retest reliability coefficient of .83 (Snyder, 1974) was reported for the original Snyder scale. No test-retest reliability data have been reported for the Lennox and Wolfe scales. One objective of this study was to compare the self-monitoring scales as to their internal consistency and stability over time with the same group of subjects.

Congruent with the modest coefficient alphas for Snyder's scale are the findings of factor analytic studies of the Snyder scale which indicate that it dependably yields three factors: Acting ability, Extraversion, and Otherdirectedness (Briggs et al.,1980; Gabrenya and Arkin, 1980; Penner and Wymer,

1983). A second objective of this study was to intercorrelate these three factors and the Lennox and Wolfe scales to help define the interrelationships between the scales.

A third objective was to compare the scale factors with variables (cross situational variability of behavior, and self-esteem) relevant to self-monitoring to see the congruence between the various self-monitoring scales and their construct. The self-monitoring construct predicts higher cross situational variability for high than for low self-monitors (Snyder, 1974). From the description of high self-monitors as competent, confident impression managers one would predict that high self-monitoring should be positively correlated with self-esteem. Snyder found no relationship between the original self-monitoring scale and self-esteem. Briggs et al. (1980) found an inconsistent pattern of relationships between the three Snyder factors and self-esteem. Of major interest were whether the present data would replicate the earlier results and whether the Lennox and Wolfe scales were consistently related to self-esteem.

Method

Subjects. Subjects were 138 general psychology students (67 males and 71 females) from Missouri Western State College.

Procedure. The experiment was divided into three phases: pretest, experimental manipulation, and post-test. In the first phase 138 subjects were given a questionnaire (in class) containing the Snyder and Lennox and Wolfe Self-Monitoring Scales, Janis-Field (Eagly, 1967) and Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Scales, and a list of 18 value situations. These 18 value questions used five-point response formats (i.e., strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree).

One week after phase one, another researcher entered the classroom and stated that he had randomly selected certain people for an experiment and asked them to volunteer to participate. Those selected were the one-third highest and the one-third lowest scorers on a pretest combination of CSV, ASCI, and AMSP. Only one person refused to participate. However, 12 people identified in phase one were not present. The experimenter took the true subjects (one at a time) to a room where they met two other "subjects" (actually

confederates of the experimenter). The confederates were always the same sex as the subjects. The experimenter then left the room. The confederates had been trained to create an air of agreeability by the use of friendly conversation and eye contact. Shortly thereafter another individual (the same sex as the subject) entered the room and asked the participants to answer a few questions. The twelve questions asked were from the list of 18 value questions used in phase one. The confederates knew how the subject had previously responded to these questions. Questions were asked and answered orally in a round robin manner. The confederates gave the same answers as the subject except on four critical questions where the subject was the last to respond. On these questions the confederates gave identical responses that were two scale positions away from the answer the subject had given in class (e.g., if the subject had answered "agree," the confederates would answer "disagree"). The subject was given one point for each scale point deviation from the in-class responses on the critical questions.

In phase three, the person who administered the first questionnaire returned to the original classes three weeks later to give a post-test. One hundred and

one students were present for the post-test. Ninety-nine of these students had also been present for the pretest and were matched for the test-retest reliability data.

Results and Discussion

Insert Table 1 about here

The internal consistency (coefficient alpha), and test-retest reliability coefficients are shown in Table 1. Coefficient alphas (calculated from the pretest data) were calculated for the Snyder scales and range in value from .41 to .67 with SSMS equaling .54. The Lennox and Wolfe scales have higher values with a range of coefficients from .69 to .86. Only the AMSP subscale is well below .80. The test-retest reliability coefficients for the Snyder scales range from .58 to .81 with SSMS equaling .69. This .69 value for test-retest reliability is much smaller than the .83 value Snyder reported (Snyder,1974). The Lennox and Wolfe test-retest values range from .63 to .80. Only the AMSP scale is below .80.

These findings are consistent with previous research, indicating that the Snyder scale has weak reliability. The reliability coefficients for the

Lennox and Wolfe scales indicate good reliability, superior to that of the Snyder scale.

Insert Table 2 about here

The intercorrelations between the self-monitoring scales are shown in Table 2. The intercorrelations between the factors of the Snyder scale are low, the .45 correlation between E and AA being the highest. These correlations are very similar to those reported by Penner and Wymer (1983) and Sypher and Sypher (1983) and strongly support the contention that the original scale is composed of three factors.

The intercorrelations between the Lennox and Wolfe factors were are low, the .40 CSV and ASCI correlation being the highest. In their original construction of these scales they indicated this finding and suggested that the separate scales be considered individually as well as in combination. (Lennox and Wolfe, 1982).

The SSMS is moderately correlated with the Lennox and Wolfe scales (.43 to .46). The O factor is the most correlated with CSV (.60) and ASCI (.59). The E and AA factors are generally not related to the Lennox and Wolfe scales with the exception of AMSP (.32 and .39, respectively).

Insert Table 3 about here

The relationships between self-monitoring and self-esteem variables are presented in Table 3. The results for the Janis-Field and Rosenberg scales are similar. The general finding is that self-esteem is negatively related to self-monitoring, high self-monitors having lower self-esteem. The factors of the Snyder scale show an inconsistent relationship to self-esteem. The O factor has significant negative correlations (-.34, -.31) while E and AA have significant positive correlations (.35, .23, .24). Due to the opposite nature of these correlations the correlation with the SSMS is very small (-.03,-.11). These findings are similar to those of Briggs et al. (1980). The Lennox and Wolfe scales (except AMSP) show a negative relationship with self-esteem with correlations ranging in value from -.31 to -.42. The AMSP scale is not significantly related to self-esteem (.07, .04). The persistent finding that factors of the Snyder scale are dissimilarly correlated with self-esteem illustrates that some of Snyder's scales are measuring something quite different from what others of its items are measuring. The Lennox and

Wolfe scales show a somewhat more consistent relationship to self-esteem. However, the negative nature of that relationship, coupled with the negative relationship with the Snyder O factor (the factor with the largest number of items on the original scale), is contrary to Snyder's construct, which describes the high self-monitors as smooth, confident social manipulators.

Insert Table 4 about here

The relationship between self-monitoring and behavioral cross situational variability is shown in Table 4. These data indicate that high self-monitors show significantly more cross situational variability than low self-monitors; however, the correlations are modest. On the Snyder scales O (.31) and SSMS (.30) are significantly related; however, E (.06) and AA (.18) are not. On the Lennox and Wolfe scales only CSV (.13) did not show a significant relationship with behavioral cross situational variability. The inconsistent relationship between the factors of the Snyder scale and behavioral cross situational variability is a serious problem. For the overall scale, high self-monitoring is related to cross situational

variability; however, the relationship is apparently due to the other-directedness factor. The E and AA factors are not significantly related to cross situational variability. This supports the notion of Lennox and Wolfe (1982, 1984) and Briggs et al. (1980) that the AA and E variables do not belong in the scale.

Study 2

An important tenet of the self-monitoring construct is that the high self-monitor is particularly aware of social situations and their associated social cues. This information is used to regulate the person's own verbal and nonverbal self-presentation. Low self-monitors are much less aware of or concerned with social cues as they rely on inner directives to regulate their behavior. Due to their greater awareness of and use of social information, it is predicted that high self-monitors (as compared to low self-monitors) are more accurate in their perception of social information. This prediction is supported by research by Snyder (1974) in which high self-monitors (compared to low self-monitors) were found to be more accurate in their perception of facial and vocal stimuli. This study examines the accuracy of perception of social cues as a function of self-monitoring.

Method

Subjects. Thirty-five psychology students from Missouri Western State College served as subjects.

Procedures. The subjects were shown two short (3 min. and 4 sec., and 3 min. and 42 sec.) film clips depicting social interaction. After each film clip the subjects were given a quiz to measure their recall of the film clip's factual content (names, dress, approximate ages, stated complaints) and interpersonal characteristics (emotions expressed, personal concerns, expectations of the other people). After the second quiz, subjects filled out the previously used self-monitoring scales.

Results and Discussion

Insert Table 5 about here

Table 5 contains the intercorrelations between self-monitoring and the sum of the subjects' scores on the quizzes. These correlations are generally negative, suggesting that high self-monitors are not more accurate in their recall of the film clip material than low self-monitors. None of the correlations for the Snyder scale is significant. The Lennox and Wolfe scale CSV and shows a significant

negative correlation (-.46, -.34, -.48) with accuracy of social perception.

The prediction that high self-monitors are more accurate in their perception of social information is not supported by these data. In fact, the data suggest that they may be less accurate. If this finding is not a result of a small sample size, or the measurement of accuracy of perception, it presents a serious challenge to the self-monitoring concept. Further research into this question is needed.

Study 3

In support of the discriminant validity of the original self-monitoring scale, Snyder (1974) correlated his scales with a number of related scales and concepts. The data suggested that self-monitoring was distinct from such things as other-directedness, self-esteem, Machiavellianism, social chameleon, and social desirability. The almost complete lack of relationship between these concepts and self-monitoring is most puzzling. There is enough conceptual similarity between them to suggest that modest intercorrelations between the scales measuring the concepts should exist. Snyder suggested that the lack of correlation between his self-monitoring scale and the other concepts and scales supports the discriminant

validity of his scale. However, it is also possible that the observed lack of intercorrelation is due to the weak reliability of the Snyder scale (see Study 1) or the multidimensionality of the Snyder scale. The multidimensionality problem is exemplified in Study 1 in the correlation between self-monitoring and self-esteem. In this case the overall scale was not correlated with self-esteem; however, the factors of the scale were significantly correlated with self-esteem. The purpose of Study 3 was to look at the last possibility by examining the pattern of intercorrelaton between the factors of the self-monitoring scales and other-directedness, social desirability, and P, R, and C performance styles (Ring and Wallston, 1968).

Method

Subjects. One-hundred general psychology students from Missouri Western State College served as subjects.

Procedures. Subjects were asked during their classes to fill out a questionnaire containing the self-monitoring scales, Kassarjian's (1962) inner-other directedness scale, the Performance Style Test (Ring and Wallston, 1968), and the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (1964).

Results and Discussion

Insert Table 6 about here

The intercorrelations between the self-monitoring scales and the other variables in this study are shown in Table 6. Similar to the results reported by Snyder (1974), the present data show low correlations between SSMS and inner-other directedness (.22), social desirability (-.26), and performance style C (social chameleon, .03). The present data indicate a modest correlation between SSMS and performance styles P (.48) and R (.35). Correlations for these variables were not reported by Snyder (1974). The factors of SSMS show an interesting pattern of correlation with the other variables. Factors E and AA have a similar pattern of relationship with the other variables: significant correlations with P (-.61,-.39) and R (.57,.45), and nonsignificant correlations with inner-other directedness (.13,-.15), performance style C (.02,.03) and social desirability (-.06,-.01). Factor O shows a reverse pattern: significant correlations with inner-other directedness (.21) and social desirability (-.36) and nonsignificant correlations with performance styles P (-.09), R

(-.09), and C (.09). The idea that the low correlation between self-monitoring and the other variables is due to the multidimensionality of the SSMS is at least somewhat supported by these data. However, with the exception of performance styles P and R, even the factors of SSMS are only modestly related to the variables studied. It is noteworthy that as seen in Study 1 and the work by Briggs et al. (1980), Sypher and Sypher (1983), and Penner and Wymer (1983), individuals scoring high on O have very different characteristics than those scoring high on E or AA.

The Lennox and Wolfe scales show a mixed pattern of modest to nonsignificant relationships with these other variables. The factors of the scale show an inconsistent pattern of intercorrelations between the various variables. Inner-other directedness is significantly correlated to ASCI (.26) but not to CSV (.02) nor AMSP (.13). For the performance styles: P is significantly related to ASCI (-.17) and AMSP (-.30) but not to CSV (.12); R is significantly related to CSV (-.19) and AMSP (.27) but not to ASCI (-.10); C is significantly related to ASCI (.35), but not to CSV (.00) nor AMSP (.11). Social desirability shows a significant relationship with CSV (-.34) and ASCI (-.23), but not with AMSP (.10).

When one considers some of the conceptual similarities between self-monitoring and these other variables, one wonders why there are not stronger correlations between them. The inconsistent pattern of correlation between the factors of both the Snyder and Lennox and Wolfe scales and these other variables raises questions as to what the self-monitoring scales are measuring.

Conclusions

The results of these three studies are not very supportive of the Snyder Self-Monitoring Scale. The reliability of the full scale and factors of the scale is weak. The data support the persistent finding that the scale is multidimensional. The factors of the scale correlate dissimilarly with important characteristics of self-monitors. Only the other-directedness factor is significantly related to behavioral cross situational variability. Contrary to expectation, high self-monitors (full scale or the three factors) are not more accurate in their perception of social information. The factors of the scale correlate dissimilarly with self-esteem, inner-other directedness, social desirability, and performance styles P, R, and C. Conceptually the other-directedness factor seems to be the most central

to the self-monitoring construct; however, individuals high on the other-directedness factor possess lower self-esteem and less social desireability response set, characteristics contrary to Snyder's construct.

The Lennox and Wolfe scales show somewhat better psychometric properties. They have acceptable levels of reliability. The three factors are relatively independent and show a somewhat more consistent pattern of relationships with related variables. High scores on these scales are associated with greater cross situational variability (the CSV correlation was not significant), less accurate perception of social information (the ASCI and AMSP correlations were not significant), lower self-esteem (the AMSP correlation was not significant), and less social desirability response set.

Most of the research which has been supportive of the self-monitoring construct has used the original Snyder scale. The weak reliability and multidimensionality of this scale bring into serious question the usefulness of this evidence in support of the self-monitoring construct. Both the Snyder and Lennox and Wolfe scales represent an honest effort to measure Snyder's self-monitoring construct. Unfortunately, high scorers on these scales are found

to possess characteristics quite different from those which could be reasonably predicted from Snyder's construct. If these scales adequately represent Snyder's construct, one must seriously question the validity of self-monitoring as presently conceptualized.

References

Arkin, R. M., Gabrenya, W. K., Jr., Appleman, S. S., & Cochran, S.T. (1979). Self-presentation, self-monitoring, and self-serving bias in causal attribution. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 73-75.

Briggs, S. R., Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1980). Analysis of self- monitoring scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 679-686.

Eagley, Alice H. (1967 November). Sex differences as a determinant of response to favorable and unfavorable information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph, Vol. 7, 3, (Whole No. 643), 1-15

Gabrenya, W. K. Jr., & Arkin, R. M. (1980). Self-monitoring scale: Factor structure and correlates. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 6, 13-22.

Kassarjian, W. M. (1962). A study of Reisman's theory of social character. Sociometry, 25, 213-230.

Kulik, J. A., & Taylor, S. E. (1981). Self-monitoring and the use of consensus information. Journal of Personality, 49, 75-84.

Lennox, Richard D., and Wolfe, Raymond N., (1982 August). Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. Paper presented at A.P.A., Washington D. C.

Lennox, Richard D., and Wolfe, Raymond N., (1984). Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 1349-1364.

Penner, Louis A., & Wymer William E., (1983). The Moderator Variable Approach to Behavioral Predictability: Some of the Variables some of the Time. Journal of Research in Personality, 17, 339-353.

Ring, K., & Wallston, K., (1968). A test to measure performance styles in interpersonal relations. Psychological Reports, 22, 147-154.

Rosenberg, Morris, (1965). Society and the Adolescent Self-Image, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Santee, R. T., & Maslach, C. (1982). To agree or not to agree: Personal dissent amid pressure to conform. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 690-700.

Schneiderman, W. (undated). Self-monitoring, cross-sectional consistency, and social desirability. Unpublished manuscript, Marshall University.

Snyder, M. (1974). The self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 526-537.

Sypher, Beverly Davenport, & Sypher, Howard E. (1983 June). Preceptions of Communication Ability Self-Monitoring in an Organizational Setting. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Vol. 9, 2, 297-304.

Wolfe, R. N., Lennox, R. D., & Hundiburg., R. A. (1982, August). Self-monitoring as a moderator variable: A new SM scale. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C. .

Zanna, M. P., Olson, J. M., & Fazio, R. H. (1980). Attitude-behavior consistency: An individual differences perspective. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 432-440.

Zuckerman, M., & Reis, H. T. (1978). Comparison of three models for predicting altrustic behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 498-510.

Table 1

Reliability of Self-Monitoring Scales:

Test-Retest and Coefficient Alpha

Scale	Coefficient-Alpha[1]	Test-Retest[2]
Snyder		
1. Extraversion (E)	.41	.58
2. Other directedness (O)	.67	.73
3. Acting Ability (AA)	.55	.81
4. Snyder Self-Monitoring Scale (SSMS)	.54	.69
Lennox and Wolfe		
1. Cross Situational Variability (CSV)	.78	.80
2. Attention to Social Comparison Information (ASCI)	.86	.80
3. Ability to Modify Self Presentation (AMSP)	.69	.63

1. Pretest data, N=138

2. Matched pretest post-test data, N=98

Table 2

Intercorrelations Between the Self-Monitoring Scales

Variable	O	AA	SSMS	CSV	ASCI	AMSP
Snyder						
1. Extraversion (E)	.19	.45**	.52**	-.06	.01	.32**
2. Other directedness (O)		.11	.76**	.60**	.59**	.28**
3. Acting Ability (AA)			.59**	.03	.06	.39**
4. Snyder Self-Monitoring Scale (SSMS)				.43**	.46**	.45**
Lennox and Wolfe						
1. Cross Situational Variability (CSV)					.40**	.21**
2. Attention to Social Comparison Information (ASCI)						.19*
3. Ability to Modify Self Presentation (AMSP)						

Pretest data, N=138, *p<.05, **p<.01, two-tailed

Table 3

Intercorrelations Between Self-Monitoring Scales and Self-Esteem

Variable	Janis-Field	Rosenberg
Snyder		
1. Extraversion (E)	.35*	.23*
2. Other directedness (O)	-.34*	-.31*
3. Acting Ability (AA)	.24*	.11
4. Snyder Self-Monitoring Scale (SSMS)	-.03	-.11
Lennox and Wolfe		
1. Cross Situational Variability (CSV)	-.35*	-.31*
2. Attention to Social Comparison Information (ASCI)	-.37*	-.31*
3. Ability to Modify Self Presentation (AMSP)	.07	.04

Pretest data, N=138, *p<.01, two-tailed

Table 4

Intercorrelations Between Self-Monitoring Scales and Behavioral Cross Situational Variability

Variable	Behavioral Cross Situational Variability
Snyder	
1. Extraversion (E)	.06
2. Other directedness (O)	.31**
3. Acting Ability (AA)	.18
4. Snyder Self-Monitoring Scale (SSMS)	.30
Lennox and Wolfe	
1. Cross Situational Variability (CSV)	.13
2. Attention to Social Comparison Information (ASCI)	.37**
3. Ability to Modify Self Presentation (AMSP)	.26**

N=63, ** p>.01, two-tailed

Table 5

Accuracy of Perception of Social Information and Self-Monitoring Scales

Variable	Factual Information	Inferential Information	Total Information
Snyder			
1. Extraversion (E)	-.08	-.18	-.17
2. Other directedness (O)	-.30	-.09	-.21
3. Acting Ability (AA)	.05	.22	.19
Snyder Self-Monitoring Scale (SSMS)	-.37	.07	-.12
Lennox and Wolfe			
1. Cross Situational Variability (CSV)	-.46**	-.34*	-.48**
2. Attention to Social Comparison Information (ASCI)	-.22	-.21	-.26
3. Ability to Modify Self Presentation (AMSP)	-.26	.06	-.08

N=34, **p<.01, two-tailed

Table 6

Intercorrelations Between Self-Monitoring Scales and Related Concepts

Variable	Inner-Other Directedness	Performance Style			Social Desirability
		P	R	C	
Snyder					
1. Extraversion (E)	.13	-.61**	.57**	.02	.06
2. Other directedness (O)	.21*	-.09	-.09	.09	-.36**
3. Acting Ability (AA)	-.03	-.39**	.45**	-.15	-.01
4. Snyder Self-Monitoring Scales (SSMS)	.22*	-.48**	.35**	.03	-.26**
Lennox and Wolfe					
1. Cross Situational Variability (CSV)	.02	.12	-.19**	.00	-.34**
2. Attention to Social Comparison Information (ASCI)	.26**	-.17*	-.10	.35**	-.23**
3. Ability to Modify Self Presentation (AMSP)	.13	-.30**	.27*	.11	-.10

N=100. *p<.05, **p<.01, two-tailed